

REMARKS

The applicants appreciate the acknowledgment of foreign priority, and the indication that all certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

Also, the applicants appreciate the indication that the examiner has considered the Forms PTO-1449 submitted on January 29, 2004 and September 16, 2004.

Claims 1 and 5 – 8 are pending. Claims 2 – 4 and 9 – 16 have been canceled. The applicants respectfully request reconsideration and allowance of this application in view of the above amendments and the following remarks.

The drawings, and specifically FIG. 3, were objected to because reference number “10” was incorrectly used in FIG. 3. The attached Replacement Sheet, which includes amended FIG. 3, amends the use of the reference number “10” that appeared in original FIG. 3 to read “20”. Approval and entry of the Replacement Sheet is respectfully requested. The specification has been amended to correspond to the revised numbering in FIG. 3.

The specification was objected to because of a noted informality. In response, the applicants have amended the specification at page 1, line 8 to correct the noted informality.

Claims 1, 3 and 4 were objected to due to note informalities. In response, the applicants have amended claim 7 as suggested by the examiner. Withdrawal of the examiner’s objection to these claims is respectfully requested.

Claims 1, 7 and 8 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,848,365, Coverdill (“Coverdill”). Claim 5 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Coverdill in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,629,606, Asada (“Asada”). Claim 6 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Coverdill in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,568,529, Masuda (“Masuda”). Insofar as these rejections may be applied to

the claims as amended, these rejections are respectfully traversed for reasons including the following, which are provided by way of example.

Support for the amendment to claim 1 is located in the specification, for example, page 11, lines 12 – 25. Claim 1 has also been amended to incorporate claims 2 – 4.

As described in the application, one or more aspects is directed to solving the problem of providing “an instantaneous wire interruption detection system for an electrical system of a vehicle that can detect instantaneous wire interruption (a temporary contact failure) that occurs in the electrical system of the vehicle due to the temporary contact failure.” (Specification page 3, lines 8 - 13.)

Claim 1 recites, in combination, “a signal abnormality detection portion for detecting a signal abnormality, the signal abnormality being temporarily reproduced when a repair center vibrates a signal wire of the vehicle.” That is, the signal abnormality is intentionally generated.

Without conceding that Coverdill discloses any feature of the present invention, Coverdill discloses that a data logging unit (30) stores abnormality generation information during vehicle travel and situations before and after the abnormality generation. A serviceman at a vehicle repair center then connects a computer into the data port (78) to read the information stored in the data logging unit (30) to identify the reasons the abnormality information was generated.

The office action asserts that Coverdill discloses the invention as claimed. To the contrary, Coverdill fails to teach or suggest the invention, as presently claimed, when the claims are considered as a whole. Coverdill fails to teach or suggests, for example, “the signal abnormality being temporarily reproduced when a repair center vibrates a signal wire of the vehicle.” (See, e.g., claim 1.) To the contrary, Coverdill teaches that the abnormality generation information was previously stored, the information being dumped later.

Coverdill fails to teach or suggest, for example, these elements recited in independent claim 1. It is respectfully submitted therefore that claim 1 is patentable over Coverdill.

For at least these reasons, the combination of features recited in independent claim 1, when interpreted as a whole, is submitted to patentably distinguish over the prior art. In addition, Coverdill clearly fails to show other recited elements as well.

With respect to the rejected dependent claims, the applicants respectfully submit that these claims are allowable not only by virtue of their dependency from independent claim 1, but also because of additional features they recite in combination.


The applicants respectfully submit that, as described above, the cited prior art does not show or suggest the combination of features recited in the claims. The applicants do not concede that the cited prior art shows any of the elements recited in the claims. However, the applicants have provided specific examples of elements in the claims that are clearly not present in the cited prior art.

The applicants strongly emphasize that one reviewing the prosecution history should not interpret any of the examples the applicants have described herein in connection with distinguishing over the prior art as limiting to those specific features in isolation. Rather, for the sake of simplicity, the applicants have provided examples of why the claims described above are distinguishable over the cited prior art.

Claims 2 – 4 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Coverdill in view of U.S. Patent No. 3,601,655, Andersen (“Andersen”). Claims 9 – 16 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) under various combinations of Coverdill, U.S. Patent No. 6,745,153, White et al. (“White”), Andersen and Masuda. Because claims 2 – 4 and 9 – 16 have been canceled, it is respectfully submitted that these rejections are moot.

In view of the foregoing, the applicants respectfully submit that this application is in condition for allowance. If questions relating to patentability remain, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned by telephone. Please charge any unforeseen fees that may be due to Deposit Account No. 50-1147.

Respectfully submitted,



Cynthia K. Nicholson
Reg. No. 36,880

Posz Law Group, PLC
12040 South Lakes Drive, Suite 10
Reston, VA 20191
Phone 703-707-9110
Fax 703-707-9112
Customer No. 23400

AMENDMENTS TO THE DRAWINGS

Please replace the original drawing sheet that included FIG. 3 with the Replacement Sheet of drawing figures submitted herewith. This Replacement Sheet, which includes amended FIG. 3, corrects the incorrect use of the reference number "10" that appeared in original FIG. 3. Approval and entry of the Replacement Sheet is respectfully requested.

Attachments: One (1) Replacement Sheet (FIG. 3)